

Exhibit 12

M7T8GOOC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----x

3 GOOGLE LLC,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

21 Cv. 10260 (DLC)

6 DMITRY STAROVIKOV and
7 ALEXANDER FILIPPOV,

8 Defendants.

Remote Conference

-----x

9
10 July 29, 2022
2:00 p.m.

11 Before:

12 HON. DENISE L. COTE,

13 District Judge

14 APPEARANCES

15 KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 BY: LAURA E. HARRIS

17 IGOR B. LITVAK
Attorney for Defendants
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

M7T8GOOC

(The Court and parties appearing via teleconference)

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Is counsel for the plaintiff ready to proceed?

MS. HARRIS: Yes, your Honor. This is Laura Harris from King & Spalding for plaintiff.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Harris.

For the defendants, is counsel ready to proceed?

MR. LITVAK: Yes, your Honor. Good afternoon. This is attorney Igor Litvak on behalf of the defendants, and I am ready to proceed.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Litvak, it is difficult for me to hear you. Are you using a landline?

MR. LITVAK: How about now? I am using my cell phone. Is this better?

THE COURT: It is better. I can hear you better now. Thank you very much.

I have letters from counsel of July 19th from Google and from the defendants of July 25th. There is a dispute about the defendants' cooperation with discovery requests or the initial disclosure requirements, and the defendants' letter of July 25th responds to complaints that the plaintiff has. We have a request also by the defendants to cancel a settlement conference, which is scheduled for August. And in September, a letter is due from the defendants regarding their efforts to

M7T8GOOC

1 date and success in obtaining international passports.

2 So that's an outline of what we have to address today.

3 Let me ask you, Ms. Harris, did you wish to add
4 anything having received the defendants' July 25 letter?

5 MS. HARRIS: Yes, your Honor.

6 Our letter highlights deficiencies in defendants'
7 initial disclosures, but we think this dispute and Mr. Litvak's
8 letter from earlier in the week in particular has revealed what
9 we think is much more serious discovery misconduct on the part
10 of both defendants and, frankly, their counsel.

11 First, and I think just starting with the defendants,
12 what appears to be happening is that the defendants are
13 attempting to make key evidence -- the devices, whatever might
14 be on the devices -- unavailable by contending that they no
15 longer work for Valtron and no longer, quote unquote, possess
16 devices and other relevant materials.

17 As an initial matter, we don't believe them when they
18 say they no longer work Valtron, because they represented as
19 recently as March 14th in their declarations that they
20 continued to work for the company and Mr. Litvak never informed
21 us of any change in their employment status, including in their
22 Rule 26(f) submissions and conferences that we had in
23 connection with those submissions in late May.

24 But more to the point, even if their representations
25 regarding their employment are true, and we don't think they

M7T8GOOC

1 are, those distinctions among various corporate entities simply
2 make no difference. They are irrelevant for the purposes of
3 determining their discovery obligations. They operate and
4 manage a cybercriminal enterprise, and we have alleged and
5 established that the enterprise comprised numerous entities,
6 each of which played a role in effecting their various schemes.
7 And even if they had established new paper companies in service
8 of what essentially seems to be an evident shell game, their
9 discovery obligations are no different. If they have evidence
10 concerning Glupteba, they have to produce it regardless of
11 whether that evidence was obtained in connection with their
12 employment for Valtron or anywhere else. That's why the
13 relevant tests for determining whether they have any obligation
14 to produce any particular piece of evidence has nothing to do
15 with possession, but whether they have the practical ability to
16 obtain it. And here we think it's clear that they are still
17 connected to the enterprise.

18 Mr. Litvak indicated in his letter on Monday that they
19 still intend to oppose the motion for default judgment, and he
20 stated that the injunction in place harms their business
21 interests. And those positions simply can't both be true. In
22 either case they violated discovery obligations. Either they
23 truly have left the game and they no longer control the
24 documents or devices, in which case they violated their
25 preservation obligations under the federal rules and don't have

M7T8GOOC

1 standing to contest our motion for default judgment, or they
2 remain a part of the enterprise and are obligated to produce
3 all relevant documents, and their failure to do so again puts
4 them in jeopardy under Rule 37.

5 In any event, we think Mr. Litvak should disclose the
6 date on which defendants purport to have left Valtron, the date
7 on which they contend they returned their devices, and should
8 provide a list of the devices themselves. We have those in our
9 discovery requests, but we think, given the significance of
10 this evidence and the significance of the evidence to the case,
11 that it's worth escalating those particular requests and
12 obtaining that information earlier rather than later. And
13 partly because they were required to disclose much of that
14 information in their initial disclosures.

15 The second issue we wanted to raise concerns Mr.
16 Litvak's own conduct in connection with this issue. And just
17 to give a little bit of background. As I mentioned, in late
18 May the parties had several meet-and-confers in connection with
19 our obligations under Rule 26(f) and as part of our efforts to
20 prepare the Rule 26(f) report that we submitted to the Court.
21 And as part of those conversations, Mr. Litvak sought to impose
22 essentially a reciprocal exchange of devices for inspection; in
23 other words, he wanted Google to turn over devices in exchange
24 for defendants' devices. And, as is reflected in the 26(f)
25 report, each side recognized that there is obviously a duty to

M7T8GOOC

1 preserve that evidence.

2 We didn't think that a reciprocal exchange was
3 appropriate so we declined that offer, but the obligation to
4 preserve relevant evidence is obviously still in place. And at
5 no point in those conversations did Mr. Litvak express any
6 concerns about evidence preservation. He didn't indicate the
7 defendants' employment was coming to an end, or indicate that
8 that might have any effect on their ability to actually produce
9 relevant devices or evidence. That's an extraordinary
10 omission. And given Mr. Litvak's earlier efforts to
11 essentially induce us to produce our own devices, we have two
12 concerns.

13 The first is that defendants' defense is simply an
14 effort -- defense in this case more broadly -- is just an
15 effort to obtain information from Google regarding its
16 cybersecurity operations, and that Mr. Litvak is somehow
17 knowingly participating in that effort; and second, that Mr.
18 Litvak is assisting his clients in attempting to make this
19 evidence unavailable. And again, as a legal matter, we don't
20 think that effort is going to be successful given the relevant
21 standard.

22 So, we would ask that the Court require Mr. Litvak to
23 submit a declaration detailing his efforts to preserve relevant
24 evidence in this case, including the date on which he became
25 aware his clients were no longer Valtron employees and the date

M7T8GOOC

1 on which he purports to have learned that they returned those
2 devices to Valtron.

3 Your Honor, I can stop there, but I am happy to answer
4 any questions that the Court might have.

5 THE COURT: Let me turn this over to Mr. Litvak.

6 Mr. Litvak, did you hear what Ms. Harris just said?

7 MR. LITVAK: Yes, of course. Plaintiff's counsel has
8 been doing nothing but from the beginning of this case of
9 accusing my clients of being cybercriminals and somehow their
10 counsel of being involved in that with them or doing something
11 that's illegal or unethical. I have done nothing like that.
12 The only thing I have done is to defend my clients who Google
13 decided to sue.

14 First of all, I want to address a few things. To
15 begin, when Ms. Harris was talking about the communication when
16 we were negotiating our joint report, those paragraphs about
17 providing devices, those paragraphs were proposed by Google.
18 Initially, when I saw them, I asked them to take it out. I
19 told them, listen -- first of all, I never told them that my
20 clients have any devices at all. In the beginning, I told
21 them, let's take it out, I don't want this in there, because I
22 don't think it's going to be possible. At least I implied
23 that. Google initially told me, no, we want to keep it in
24 there because we want to get the devices. So I told them fine.
25 You want to keep it in there, at least make it reciprocal so

M7T8GOOC

1 this way it's fair to both sides. If you guys are proposing
2 it, something my clients have to do, do the same thing that
3 Google have to do. That's when Google said, you know what, we
4 are not going to do it, and it never made it into the report;
5 it never made it into the final joint report.

6 Again, I have never told Google or their counsel that
7 they have any devices at all. We have never discussed that.
8 And I never -- again, I am thinking back right now. Ms. Harris
9 mentioned that in the declarations they indicated they still
10 work for Valtron. I don't have the declarations in front of
11 me. I don't remember that was in there. I will have to go
12 back and check, but I don't think -- I think they did mention
13 that they used to work for Valtron, but I don't remember them
14 saying that they still work for Valtron.

15 Now, in terms of the devices, the first time we had a
16 chance to discuss the devices, that's when I told them. By the
17 way, I have been telling them from the beginning that Valtron
18 is the employer for whom they work. That was their position
19 from day one. And I even told Google, why don't you sue
20 Valtron? They have all the devices. They have all the
21 evidence. Bring them in. For some unknown reason, your Honor,
22 Google decides it's not doing that. I have no idea why.

23 So, in terms of initial disclosures, my clients
24 completely complied with everything it's supposed to comply
25 with. They don't know the last names. I explained in my

M7T8GOOC

1 letter why they don't know the last names. They don't have the
2 devices because those devices were returned to the employer.
3 At least that's what they tell me. I have no reason not to
4 believe that, at least right now.

5 You know, Google talks about the fact that my clients
6 somehow are doing something improper to get the discovery.
7 They sued them. Google sued them. Getting discovery is a
8 normal part of the process. Are they accusing my clients of
9 doing something that they are allowed to do under the law? And
10 this is coming from the plaintiff who hasn't served any
11 discovery whatsoever in this case. And now it's demanding
12 something way beyond what is required by the statute. And now
13 they want me to submit some statement based on -- some
14 affidavit based on their suspicions? That's what they have.
15 Nothing else.

16 I know they filed a very fancy complaint with a lot of
17 allegations in federal court. But those are allegations. They
18 haven't been tested. There has been no discovery in this case.
19 And plaintiff's counsel goes around constantly saying by
20 implication. They take every single word and turn it upside
21 down. This is unbelievable.

22 So, therefore, your Honor, we are doing everything we
23 are supposed to do under the statute. We provided all the
24 information. They have the phone numbers of those people, the
25 last names that they demand. They can call them. They can

M7T8GOOC

1 talk to them. Anything more for me to provide to them right
2 now would be beyond what the statute requires, beyond what the
3 initial disclosures require. And this is just an attempt by
4 them to get as much discovery as they can now before providing
5 any of their own.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Litvak, let me ask you a few
7 questions.

8 When did your clients leave Valtron?

9 MR. LITVAK: The only thing I can say is in 2021. I
10 don't think I should provide any more information beyond that,
11 and they don't want to provide any more information beyond
12 that. But it was in 2021. Any information more than that
13 would be provided during further discovery proceedings, your
14 Honor.

15 THE COURT: I am asking you to tell me now. When did
16 your clients leave Valtron?

17 MR. LITVAK: I just told you, your Honor. It was in
18 2021.

19 THE COURT: When in 2021?

20 MR. LITVAK: I don't have an exact date, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Do you have a month?

22 MR. LITVAK: I'm sorry?

23 THE COURT: Do you know the month they left Valtron?

24 MR. LITVAK: My clients have not disclosed that to me
25 right now.

M7T8GOOC

1 THE COURT: So you do not know the month they left
2 Valtron?

3 MR. LITVAK: Not an exact month, no.

4 THE COURT: What do you understand with respect to
5 when they left Valtron?

6 MR. LITVAK: What do I understand? It was in 2021.

7 THE COURT: You don't know what part of the year?

8 MR. LITVAK: No. I believe it was second part of the
9 year, after summer, but I don't have the exact date.

10 THE COURT: How did you learn they had left Valtron?

11 MR. LITVAK: They told me.

12 THE COURT: When did they tell you?

13 MR. LITVAK: I have to go back and look at my notes.
14 It was a few months ago. I will have to look exactly in my
15 notes. I don't have the exact date in front of me right now,
16 but they did tell me that a few months ago.

17 THE COURT: So, when you say a few months ago, are you
18 saying you knew that at the time of your meet-and-confer
19 conferences with the plaintiff's counsel in May?

20 MR. LITVAK: Do you mean after the court, after we had
21 the court? Is that what you're talking about?

22 THE COURT: You can use that as a point in time. Did
23 you know it as of -- I am looking for the date of our court
24 conferences. We had a March 1st telephone conference and we
25 had, let me see here, a June 1st conference. Did you know it

M7T8GOOC

1 as of the June 1st conference date?

2 MR. LITVAK: I definitely did not know it at the March
3 conference date. I may have known by the June conference date.
4 I cannot recall right now. I would have to check my notes.
5 But again, even if I knew, I don't remember right now, but even
6 if I knew, that's not something that was discussed during our
7 meet-and-confer after the court appearance.

8 THE COURT: So let me turn to the month of May. I
9 understand that in anticipation of the June conference with the
10 Court, you had conversations with plaintiff's counsel to
11 prepare a proposed schedule for this litigation that you would
12 submit to me in advance of the June conference. At the time of
13 those May conversations with plaintiff's counsel, did you know
14 that your clients no longer worked at Valtron?

15 MR. LITVAK: I don't remember. Maybe. Again, even if
16 I knew or didn't know, those issues were never raised or
17 discussed between the counsel for the plaintiff. If I knew at
18 that time and plaintiff's counsel would have asked me, of
19 course I would have told them if I knew. The first opportunity
20 when this was discussed, directly discussed, when this was
21 raised as an issue, this was at our last meet-and-confer, and
22 that's when I informed the plaintiff's counsel.

23 THE COURT: What are you referring to? What
24 conference date are you referring to?

25 MR. LITVAK: That was a meet-and-confer that just me

M7T8GOOC

1 and plaintiff's counsel had over the phone. I think it was
2 June 27. Hold on. Let me see. It was June 27, a
3 meet-and-confer. It was a telephone conference with
4 plaintiff's counsel.

5 THE COURT: One of the accusations that I understand
6 plaintiff's counsel is making here is that at the time that you
7 had meetings and conversations with plaintiff's counsel in May,
8 you suggested that if the defendants were going to have to
9 produce their devices, that the plaintiff produce devices in a
10 reciprocal exchange. And the question is whether you made that
11 suggestion knowing that the defendants had no devices to
12 produce or were at least taking the position that they had no
13 devices to produce?

14 Do you understand what I am saying, Mr. Litvak?

15 MR. LITVAK: No, your Honor. Absolutely not. Because
16 my initial suggestion to the plaintiff's counsel was to
17 completely take out that sentence. I told them, let's take it
18 out. And they insisted on keeping it in. That's what they
19 did. They said, Oh, no, no, no, we want to keep it in. So I
20 told them, OK, if you want to keep it in, just make it the same
21 so it works the same in both ways. And I believe the language
22 was, I don't have it in front of me, but if you have
23 possession, control, something like that.

24 I never told during all of those conversations, I
25 never told, Oh, by the way, Ms. Harris, my clients have

M7T8GOOC

1 devices. I never told her that. There's no e-mail. There is
2 nothing to that effect. All we discussed in the beginning to
3 take out that sentence. That was my initial request. They
4 denied it. And after they denied it, I said, OK, fine, just
5 make it the same for both ways, so when I show it my clients,
6 at least it's fair to everybody, it's the same requirement to
7 everybody. I never told them, I never told them my clients had
8 devices. Absolutely not. And I never implied.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Litvak, the plaintiff's counsel is
10 making the point that in those May conversations you did not
11 disclose to Google that your clients had no devices.

12 MR. LITVAK: Your Honor, we never discussed it. We
13 never discussed in May anything about devices. The first time
14 we discussed -- there was only two times we discussed something
15 about devices. The first time when we were negotiating the
16 language for the joint report, and I already explained to you
17 in the joint report Google first proposed -- it was then, they
18 proposed it, to put that language about the devices. I told
19 them not to do it. And when they said no, I told them, OK,
20 fine, if you want to do it, let's do the same language for
21 everybody. And they said, you know what, we are going to take
22 it out.

23 Then the next time we discussed anything about devices
24 was during the June 27th conference, and that's when I told
25 them, that's when I told them they don't have any devices

M7T8GOOC

1 because they return it to their employer. There was no other
2 time where the issue of devices was ever raised, as far as I
3 remember.

4 THE COURT: OK. So, Mr. Litvak, what we have here,
5 stepping back, is a situation in which the defendants have very
6 little information to share, no control over documents, no
7 access to digital information. They are taking the position
8 that they left the only relevant entity, Valtron, in 2021, and
9 have no access or control over any information that would be
10 relevant in this action. Is that right, Mr. Litvak?

11 MR. LITVAK: No, no, of course not.

12 First of all, we provided the list of documents in the
13 initial disclosures. Second of all, my clients are more than
14 willing to be deposed by the plaintiff. They want to defend
15 themselves. But they can't get something they do not have.

16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Litvak.

17 Ms. Harris.

18 MS. HARRIS: Your Honor, as an initial matter, we have
19 declarations from both defendants that they worked for Valtron
20 as software engineers, and that's in paragraph 9 of their
21 declarations at docket entry 47-2 and 47-3.

22 And with respect to our conferences at the end of May,
23 Mr. Litvak is simply wrong that we did not discuss the exchange
24 of devices, and we are happy to submit to the Court e-mail
25 exchanges on the various drafts that the parties exchanged in

M7T8GOOC

1 which it is clear that we were discussing devices and that Mr.
2 Litvak is, in fact, pressing us to reinstate language that he
3 has inserted about exchanging devices into the draft.

4 I think that it's clear that defendants have been
5 operating under false pretenses here, and that at some date
6 that became clear to Mr. Litvak and he neither corrected his
7 clients' declarations or informed us at the earliest date at
8 which he became aware of the change in circumstance, and
9 certainly the effect that it would have on discovery, declined
10 to provide that information. And I think the questions that I
11 raised at the outset of the hearing remain.

12 THE COURT: So what is your application, Ms. Harris?

13 MS. HARRIS: Your Honor, we would propose that we get
14 the story straight as to when defendants left Valtron and the
15 devices that they had in connection with their employment. And
16 we think that they are required to produce those devices. We
17 would like to have those devices at the earliest date possible.
18 We have included all of those requests in our discovery
19 requests, but we don't think that there is any point in
20 belaboring this, if they are going to be unable to produce
21 them, because it's clear to us that they had an obligation to
22 produce that evidence and that their failure to do so means
23 that they are in breach of those obligations.

24 Secondly, we think that Mr. Litvak should submit a
25 declaration establishing the date certain for each of your

M7T8GOOC

1 Honor's questions. Because I think sitting here today, we
2 still don't have a clear impression of the dates on which he
3 became aware of the change in circumstance and the effect that
4 that would have on discovery and the devices that are at issue.
5 And we would like to know what efforts were made to preserve
6 that evidence. And once we have that information in front of
7 us, I think we are considering, frankly, all relief that could
8 be on the table there, including terminating sanctions under
9 Rule 37; not to mention sanctions that might be appropriate in
10 light of what Mr. Litvak submits to the Court, and, frankly,
11 the statements that he has made to the Court today about what
12 was and was not discussed in connection with our Rule 26(f)
13 reports.

14 THE COURT: So, the limited series of questions that
15 you want Mr. Litvak to promptly answer, are they identified in
16 written submissions you have already served on him?

17 MS. HARRIS: We have not served discovery on Mr.
18 Litvak personally. We are happy to do that. But we have
19 served discovery on defendants that includes a number of the
20 requests that I have just made, although not in that same
21 specificity. But we are happy to re-serve and clarify, if that
22 would be useful.

23 THE COURT: I think it would be helpful to Mr. Litvak
24 to know with some precision what questions you want answered,
25 first by his clients and secondly by him. And I will let

M7T8GOOC

1 counsel talk about a schedule for Mr. Litvak's response; and,
2 of course, if he feels that any of that information should not
3 be discoverable, in the circumstances we are dealing with here,
4 I will give him a chance to explain why that is true as well.

5 When can you get the specific questions you want
6 answered by his clients and separately by Mr. Litvak to Mr.
7 Litvak?

8 MS. HARRIS: I think we are prepared to do that over
9 the weekend or on Monday, your Honor.

10 MR. LITVAK: Your Honor, can I just respond?

11 What Google is asking is an extraordinary thing. It's
12 unbelievable. It's almost getting involved in my relationship
13 between clients and counsel. This is, like, unbelievable. If
14 they want to know when my clients left Valtron, that's why we
15 have discovery process. This is a plaintiff, who hasn't
16 provided any discovery of its own, now is going to get an
17 affidavit from attorney.

18 Your Honor, the issues here I would really ask the
19 Court to reconsider. I think we already made it clear that my
20 clients don't have any devices. There is no e-mail that Google
21 counsel is able to show telling them that they do. Yes, we
22 exchanged e-mails, but everything I said before is true. They
23 proposed it. I asked for them to take it out. They didn't.
24 So then I proposed let's do it equally so it's the same
25 language for both sides. Then they said, OK, we are going to

M7T8GOOC

1 take it out. That's it. And then the next time we talked
2 about the devices was on June 27. What they are asking, your
3 Honor, is unbelievable, and I would ask the Court to deny that
4 request. They have no evidence to show that my clients or I
5 have done anything wrong in this case, nothing.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Litvak, I am giving you a chance to
7 respond. We are just setting a schedule. And if you feel that
8 a response is inappropriate to any particular question or
9 inquiry, you will have a chance to tell me that. But I must
10 say, Mr. Litvak, if the correspondence or evidence shows that
11 you discussed in May an exchange of devices, at a time that you
12 knew that there were no devices in your clients' possession
13 that could be exchanged, that is troubling. I am not deciding
14 now what was said. I don't have the record before me.

15 So, you're going to get an identified series of
16 questions for your clients and for you on Monday, which is
17 August 1. Shall we say that you will respond by August 8, give
18 you a week, Mr. Litvak, does that work for you?

19 MR. LITVAK: Yes. Hold on. Let me look at my
20 schedule.

21 Yes, that's fine.

22 THE COURT: Great.

23 So, I will send out a scheduling order for another
24 conference for the 11th or 12th when I have a chance to look at
25 my schedule. And my chambers will be in touch with counsel to

M7T8GOOC

1 try to choose a time that's good for you as well, if we need a
2 conference. Otherwise, it may just be that, depending on what
3 the response is, that this will move forward without the need
4 for a conference.

5 Let's turn to another topic here. Mr. Litvak has
6 asked for the August 10th settlement conference to be canceled.
7 Is there any objection to that, Ms. Harris?

8 MS. HARRIS: We don't take a position on it. I think
9 we are always happy to sit down, but if Mr. Litvak does not
10 think that those conversations will be productive, we don't
11 object to taking it off the calendar.

12 THE COURT: OK. So I will grant that application, Mr.
13 Litvak. The settlement conference is canceled.

14 Ms. Harris, is there any open issue to address right
15 now?

16 MS. HARRIS: Your Honor, I think the only open issue
17 pertains to the last names that were not disclosed in
18 connection with the initial disclosures. We understand Mr.
19 Litvak's position that his clients have no last names to
20 provide, but we certainly don't credit that statement given the
21 long history that his clients have had in working with those
22 individuals. But again, unless your Honor has any further
23 measures to take in that regard, we think that we are at an
24 impasse there.

25 THE COURT: Yes. And I don't have any further

M7T8GOOC

1 measures to take at this point. You have the defendants'
2 position; they do not know those names.

3 MS. HARRIS: Thank you, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Mr. Litvak, is there any open issue that
5 you believe we should discuss today?

6 MR. LITVAK: No, your Honor. There's none.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 Good luck, counsel. Thank you very much.

9 MS. HARRIS: Thank you, your Honor.

10 MR. LITVAK: Thank you.

11 (Adjourned)